DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 288 SP 009 202

TITLE Teacher Training in California.
INSTITUTION California Teachers Association, Burlingame. Div. for Instruction and Professional Development.
PUB DATE Nov 74
NOTE 23p.; A report to the Legislature Pursuant to ACR 82 (Vasconcellos) of the 1973 Legislative Session

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; Educational Demand; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; State Programs; Student Enrollment; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *California; Ryan Act

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a study of teacher training in California, including its operation, responsibilities, funding, and efficiency. Information was collected by formal questionnaires and interviews from agencies and individuals concerned with teacher training. Part 1 discusses implementation of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 (Ryan Act), which authorized a new teacher preparation and credentialing program for elementary and secondary teachers in California. Part 2 focuses on the operations of preservice teacher training programs throughout the state. Topics discussed include the following: (a) teacher surplus, (b) faculty responsibility, (c) research, (d) minority composition, and (e) alternate programs. Part 3 looks at inservice training programs. The study produced the following recommendations: (a) that the budgets of the state universities and colleges be based on reduced enrollments in the schools and departments of education, (b) that the colleges be allowed a change in budget formula to reduce student/teacher ratios in schools and departments of education, (c) that a summary of current research and experimental teaching projects be submitted annually to the California State Department of Education, and (d) that the department be directed to establish an office of inservice training. (JS)

ED106288

TEACHER TRAINING IN CALIFORNIA

A Report to the Legislature
Pursuant to ACR 82 (Vasconcellos) of the
1973 Legislative Session

November 1, 1974

Reproduced and distributed
by
Division for Instruction and
Professional Development:
Teacher Education Department
CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
1705 Marchison Drive
Burlingame, California 94010

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
State of California
State Capitol, Sacramento

SP009 202

74-12

INDEX

Page Number

Introduction

I. Pre-service Training: Legislation and Implementation 2

Legislation 2
Implementation 4

II. Pre-service Training: Operations 9

Teacher Surplus 9
Faculty Responsibilities 11
Research 13
Minority Composition 14
Alternate Programs 15

III. In-service Training 18

In-service Training Programs 18
Office of In-service Training 19

Appendix 21

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 146, Statutes of 1973 (ACR 82, Vasconcellos) directed the Legislative Analyst to undertake a study of teacher training in California, including its operation, responsibilities, funding, and efficiency. To accomplish this, our office contacted a variety of agencies and individuals concerned with teacher training, including teacher educators at public and private higher education institutions, placement officers, student teachers, experimental project personnel, consultants from the Department of Education and the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, county superintendents of schools, school district teachers and administrators, students and professional organizations.

Information was collected from these agencies and individuals by formal questionnaires and interviews. In many cases reliable data was either difficult to accumulate or nonexistent because of the following problems: (1) teacher training institutions have not developed an information system for the purpose of comparing or summarizing teacher training programs, research projects, experimental programs, enrollments, student characteristics or employment opportunities, (2) the implementation of completely new regulations (the Ryan Act) governing teacher training programs has caused confusion on all campuses, and made program descriptions and fiscal projections extremely difficult, and (3) most school districts do not develop specific program or budgetary data regarding their in-service and student teacher training programs.

In the following chapters, we have recommended changes to remedy this situation and provide the Legislature and state agencies with a reliable source of information on pre-service and in-service teacher training. Because teacher preparation programs under the Ryan Act, the new law governing teacher training, are not yet completely implemented, we have not recommended any basic program changes. We believe these programs should be permitted to operate at least a year before proposals for change are considered.

Summary of Recommendations

1. We recommend that the budgets and related planning of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be based on reduced enrollments in the schools and departments of education in light of the oversupply of teachers in California. (page 9)

2. We recommend that the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be allowed a change in budget formula to reduce student/teacher ratios in schools and departments of education so as to comply with the increased program workload and quality requirements in the Ryan Act. (page 11)

3. We recommend that the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be directed to submit an annual report to the Department of Education containing a summary of current research and experimental teaching projects conducted by the faculties of the schools and departments of education. (page 13)

4. We recommend that the State Department of Education be directed to establish an Office of In-service Training which would (1) review and evaluate school district in-service training programs, (2) operate an information and dissemination center for effective programs, (3) assist and review the development of in-service programs on a regional basis, and (4) administer a grant program for regional in-service training programs. (page 19)

CHAPTER I

PRE-SERVICE TRAINING: LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Legislation

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 (Chapter 557, Statutes of 1970), commonly referred to as the Ryan Act, authorized a new teacher preparation and credentialing program for elementary and secondary school teachers in California. This act was an attempt by the Legislature to simplify and improve the highly complex and prescriptive regulations of the Fisher Act, the law which previously regulated teacher preparation. Under both laws, the basic requirements for earning an elementary or secondary teaching credential are essentially the same:

(a) baccalaureate degree from an approved postsecondary institution;

(b) fifth year of postgraduate study;

(c) program of professional preparation, including student teaching.

The Ryan Act, however, made numerous changes in the administrative procedures and regulations which govern the fulfillment of these basic requirements. The new act transferred administrative responsibility for program accreditation and teacher credentialing from the Department of Education to an autonomous Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Members of this commission include six certificated school personnel (four of whom are full-time teachers), four faculty members of accredited colleges or universities, two school board members, and three private citizens. The Ryan Act intended that this commission would provide more direct accountability to teacher trainers, public school teachers, and the public than a bureau within the Department of Education.

Secondly, the new act provided for more flexibility within the certification process. Fisher Act provisions regarding academic majors, minors, and professional preparation courses had grown complex and narrowly prescriptive. The Ryan Act provides more flexible credential requirements to de-emphasize mechanical unit counting and instead promote an evaluation of the student's program as a whole. In addition, the credential specialties possible under the Fisher Act have been reduced by grouping narrow academic

specialties into general categories for which one credential is required. For example, the academic disciplines of drama, journalism, and speech are combined into one general academic category and a credential in this area enables a person to teach in all related disciplines.

Credentials under the Ryan Act are either (1) a teaching (or teaching specialist) credential, requiring either a multiple-subject major for elementary school teachers or a designated single-subject (English, etc.) major for secondary school teachers, or (2) a Services Credential for specialists in pupil personnel, health services, library science, and school administration.

The Ryan Act also provides an alternative procedure for fulfilling academic requirements for the teaching credential. Prospective teachers may satisfy academic requirements by passing a subject matter examination instead of being limited to the traditional method of completing an approved academic program in the specific subject matter of the credential.

Finally, the Ryan Act changes the basic mix between theoretical and field-based training activities to provide greater emphasis on student teaching and community involvement. Students educated under the Ryan Act are required to take 12-16 semester hours of student teaching rather than the 6-8 semester hours required under the Fisher Act. This additional field training involves a variety of competency-based teaching assignments including a cross-cultural experience. At the same time, the new act limits to 12 course units the number of professional preparation courses (learning theory and teaching methods) that may be required of a trainee prior to student teaching. This should insure early involvement of the trainee in the classroom.

In response to these changes in regulations governing professional preparation programs, the Commission issued the Manual for Developing, Evaluating and Approving Professional Preparation Program Plans for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials. As the title indicates, this initial document was confined to professional programs for the two basic teaching credentials required for elementary and secondary public school employment. Guidelines for these credentials were grouped into five categories:

(1) Institutional requirements. This section directs training institutions to provide teacher-training programs in all segments of the university or college and in the community at large. This includes (a) the adequate academic preparation of teacher candidates in subject matter areas commonly taught in the public schools, (b) the development of selective admissions criteria based on academic achievement, (c) a review of personal characteristics, recommendations and prior experience with children and (d) provision for systematic evaluation, counseling, and advising of teacher candidates and for the follow-up evaluation of teacher graduates.

(2) Professional Education Course Requirements. As previously mentioned, a major change instituted by the Ryan Act was to require teacher training institutions to limit professional preparation courses prior to

student teaching. Teacher training institutions must designate those professional preparation classes which are to be prerequisites to student teaching. They must also provide objectives for each course of study and describe how it relates to the acquisition of specific teacher competencies.

(3) Student Teaching Requirements. This section directs teacher training institutions to develop programs which contain thorough, relevant, and varied student teaching experience with an emphasis on classroom instruction.

In addition to the regular five-year teacher training program, institutions must develop a concentrated training program which would allow teacher candidates to fulfill academic and professional coursework and student teaching within a four-year undergraduate program. Graduates would receive a preliminary credential suitable for immediate employment but would be required to earn the equivalent of a fifth year of credits within five years of graduation.

Field training for the teacher candidate in either the four- or five-year program must consist of one semester (not less than 12 units) of full-time student teaching or its equivalent. This teaching experience must include teaching assignments at more than one grade level, in at least one cultural setting different from the cultural background of the candidate, and full-day teaching which insures that the candidate has acquired teaching skills necessary to assume a full instructional role. Institutions are required to provide for close and continual cooperation between all persons involved in teacher preparation in the field, including students, master teachers, and supervisors.

(4) Professional Competence Requirements. This section requires teacher training programs to be competency oriented. Training institutions must insure that teachers graduate with competency in essential teaching skills such as the organization of effective learning environments, pupil diagnosis and prescription, and the selection of appropriate teaching strategies and materials.

(5) Reading Course Requirements. This section requires teacher training institutions to provide a comprehensive course in the teaching of reading not to exceed four semester units. Successful completion of the reading course should insure that a teacher candidate has the ability to diagnose and prescribe remediation for a variety of reading difficulties and is able to demonstrate a competency in seven essential skill areas of reading (word recognition, vocabulary, linguistics, comprehension, study techniques, library technique and reading aloud and student motivation). Teaching candidates must spend a specified number of hours teaching reading to individual students and groups.

Implementation

The Ryan Act was approved by the Governor on July 30, 1970. The Act provided for a three-year grace period to allow the commission and teacher training institutions sufficient time to prepare for the new program. Full administrative operation of all Ryan Act provisions was originally

scheduled for January 1, 1973. However, Chapter 1465, Statutes of 1971, extended this deadline to July 1, 1973. The Ryan Act credential supplanted the Fisher Act credential as the official teaching credential in the state on September 15, 1974, the approximate beginning of the school year.

The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing assumed administrative responsibility for credentialing from the Department of Education on August 1, 1971. Subsequently, the commission appointed advisory panels of experts in the subject matter and service areas (Appendix A) designated by the Ryan Act. These panels were unable to find existing examinations adequate to the purpose of the Ryan Act and consequently prepared scope and content guidelines to be used in the development of new subject matter examinations. This examination development process has proceeded quite slowly and is not expected to be completed until July 1975.

The commission also issued extensive guidelines for the development of professional preparation programs for the single and multiple subject credential. These guidelines have been discussed in the previous section. Each training institution was required to submit a Program Approval Review Document to the commission. This document was to provide a thorough description of the teacher training program and how it had been reorganized to conform to the Ryan Act guidelines. If a program contained nonconforming elements, the institution was required to provide a timeline indicating what actions would be taken to insure their correction or provide a rationale for maintaining these elements in spite of Ryan Act guidelines.

All but one of the 69 teacher training institutions in the state submitted review documents for the professional preparation sequence and received commission approval by October 1974. Documents from six institutions were returned for noncompliance but were resubmitted and eventually received commission approval.

The commission has also distributed guidelines for the specialist teaching credential (bilingual-crosscultural, early childhood, reading, special education) and the services credentials (administration, counseling, library, health) programs. The commission expects that the program approval review documents required for these programs will be submitted by the training institutions during 1974. Therefore, it can be anticipated that programs for professional preparation, the teaching specialist credential, and the services credential will have been submitted and reviewed by the commission prior to the beginning of 1975. Students who do not complete an approved course will be required to pass an examination before certification.

Four and Five Year Programs

As a result of the Ryan Act, all institutions will now provide both a four-year and a five-year program schedule for students seeking either an elementary or secondary credential. Both programs will consist of approximately 24 semester units, half of which must be devoted to field training.

Four-year Program. The four-year program schedule will be for students who wish to earn a preliminary credential by completing their

academic and professional course requirements and student teaching in their undergraduate years. A fifth year of study (of unspecified content) would have to be completed within five years of receiving a preliminary credential. The four-year credential program had been available prior to the Ryan Act. Under the Fisher Act, approximately 25 percent of the total number of elementary school teachers graduated with a provisional credential upon completing a four-year program. However, training programs leading to the secondary school credential were almost always five-year programs.

The Ryan Act extended the four-year credential program to all institutions and to the secondary level. This represented a major program change to many institutions, and a challenge to attempt to fit a complete academic major program and a teacher training program into a four-year period. Some institutions objected to the commission on the grounds that the two programs could not realistically be combined without sacrificing important coursework in either area. Because the teacher preparation program must consist of a legislatively designated number of units, it is generally the academic program which is adjusted. Institutions have had to cut academic major and elective unit requirements to enable the teacher candidate to graduate in four years. Even with these adjustments, the candidate must be carefully counseled to insure that all units requirements are fulfilled. For these reasons, along with the existence of an excess teacher supply, many training institutions anticipate that the four-year program will be less utilized than previously. However, it remains as an option.

Five-year Program. The five-year program has been the traditional program for most elementary and secondary teacher candidates. Within this basic format, institutions offered a variety of combinations of theoretical coursework and student teaching. Generally, students were selected for teacher candidacy in their junior or senior year and enrolled in preliminary classroom observation or tutoring courses. Some institutions began theoretical coursework and student teaching in the senior year but ordinarily the professional training year was reserved for the fifth year, after a student had received a baccalaureate degree. This fifth year consisted of a combination of theoretical coursework and student teaching, the latter gradually assuming more importance as the fifth year neared completion.

In response to the Ryan Act, institutions have revised the mix between theoretical coursework and student teaching in the five-year program. In addition, most training institutions have decreased the number of credit units devoted to teaching theory to comply with the 12-unit limit of the Ryan Act. Some institutions totally reorganized and consolidated their theoretical coursework while others simply pared down existing courses.

It appears that the courses most frequently reduced were historical foundations of education and specialized methods courses in the teaching of mathematics and science. Institutions have substituted generalized teaching methods courses in the hope that the knowledge gained can be used in a variety of specialty areas.

Reading

The Ryan Act also affected the theoretical base of teacher training by mandating (with certain exceptions) a course in the teaching of reading. Most credential programs for elementary teachers had already provided at least one such course. However, courses have not been provided as part of the regular training program for prospective high school teachers. Thus, the reading requirement of the Ryan Act represents an important change, although it is not yet clear what the nature of the secondary level reading program will be. The commission hopes that these programs will encourage secondary teachers to view reading as a secondary level responsibility and problem, and provide them the tools to diagnose reading difficulties.

Student Teaching

As mentioned previously, the Ryan Act guidelines emphasized the importance of student teaching, such that it was to (a) constitute at least half of the total training program, (b) direct itself toward the training of specific teacher competencies and (c) involve a more varied field experience than a single teaching assignment.

Under the Fisher Act, the State Board of Education developed standards which required professional preparation coursework and 180 clockhours (elementary credential) or 120 clockhours (secondary credential) of actual student teaching. These time periods were the same as required under the previous teacher preparation regulations. The board also appointed an accreditation committee to review the teacher preparation programs at two- to five-year intervals. Training institutions were required to submit documents to this committee confirming compliance to the basic state minimums and to describe the structure and objectives of their programs.

The training programs developed under the Fisher Act contained many of the elements now required by the new Ryan Act. However, the Ryan Act has now compelled all training institutions to include all elements into a coherent teacher training program. In most cases, this has meant an increase in student teaching for elementary teachers of about 50 percent. Student teaching for secondary teachers has increased almost 100 percent.

Evaluation

The Ryan Act compels training institutions to establish many levels of evaluation and feedback within their programs. Candidates for admission to training programs must be selected in accordance with specific criteria, including personal characteristics, academic record, previous experience, and recommendations. As a result, institutions have been required to formalize a selection process that had often been practiced without definite guidelines.

Institutions have also been compelled to devise a continuing evaluation program for each candidate admitted to the program. This evaluation should be based on specific program objectives and include the perspectives of all persons involved in the training program, including the candidate. Final evaluation procedures have assumed a greater importance under the Ryan Act

because the institution now bears the responsibility of reporting to the commission that the candidate has acquired a minimum competency in all areas of teaching.

Under the Ryan Act, institutions have also been required to develop follow-up procedures to evaluate their graduates after they have begun teaching. This should provide data which will indicate the effectiveness of the teacher training program and the areas in need of improvement.

Single Subject Area Credentials

As an alternative to the examination process, the Ryan Act specifies that "the commission shall waive the subject matter examination requirements for graduates of accredited public and private institutions of higher education who hold specified subject matter degrees. Eligibility for an examination waiver can only be achieved when the subject matter of the degree is the same as one of the subject matter examination categories specified by the commission . . ." The commission originally interpreted this requirement to mean that an institution's academic programs will receive waived status when they comply with the scope and content requirements prepared by various subject matter panels of experts. This policy has recently been relaxed to require that institutions simply certify that their academic programs adequately prepare a student to teach a specific subject matter. The institution is no longer required to prepare each academic program in conformance with scope and content documents. However, the Legislative Counsel has reported that this new policy does not meet provisions of the Ryan Act which require the commission to evaluate subject matter degree programs. This opinion has been informally concurred with by the Attorney General. Consequently, the commission will be compelled to design a more rigorous review procedure for degree programs. In the meantime, subject matter programs will be approved if certified as adequate by the institution. The commission expects that practically all single subject matter degree programs will receive approval in this manner during the 1974-75 school year. What effect this will have on the usefulness of the examinations remains in doubt.

CHAPTER II

PRE-SERVICE TRAINING: OPERATIONS

Teacher training programs for elementary and secondary level teacher candidates are provided by 69 postsecondary institutions throughout the state. The majority (42) of these institutions are private, and, in most cases, affiliated with a religious organization. The remaining institutions (27) are public, and consist of the campuses of the University of California (8) and the State University and Colleges (19). All of these institutions operate approved teacher training programs which lead to either the elementary, secondary, or specialist teaching credentials.

Table I presents the number of teacher candidates graduated from public institutions over a five-year period who are eligible for the teacher credential. These figures should not be taken to represent total enrollment in schools of education because many enrollees are part-time graduate students who have already received their credential.

TABLE I

Elementary and Secondary Credential Candidates Graduated from Public Teacher Training Institutes

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
University of California	2,023	2,171	1,673	1,602	1,568
California State University and Colleges	7,834	8,908	9,407	10,374	12,355
TOTAL	9,857	11,079	11,080	11,976	13,923

Table I indicates that the number of new teachers available for employment has increased by 4,066 or 41 percent since 1969. This increase is primarily the result of the expanding enrollments in the California State University and Colleges.

The Department of Education and the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing were unable to provide data regarding the number of teacher graduates from private institutions. A rough estimate places this figure at between 6,000 - 7,000 graduates per year. Therefore, the combined number of new teachers currently graduated from private and public institutions is approximately 20,000 graduates per year.

Teacher Surplus

We recommend that the budgets and related planning of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be based on reduced enrollments in the schools and departments of education in light of the oversupply of teachers in California.

While the number of new teacher graduates has increased in recent years, the demand for these graduates has declined. In the last few years, California has experienced a reversal in the growth of school enrollments. Table II presents historical and projected school enrollments for grades K-12. Data presented in this table are graded classroom enrollment only and exclude certain special education programs, continuation high schools, and adult education.

TABLE II

Public School Enrollments
(in thousands)

School Year	Grade Level K-8	Grade Level 9-12	Total	Change Amount	Change Percent
1965-66	3,010	1,110	4,121		
1966-67	3,087	1,147	4,235	113	2.8%
1967-68	3,145	1,184	4,330	95	2.2
1968-69	3,186	1,225	4,412	81	1.9
1969-70	3,178	1,262	4,440	28	.6
1970-71	3,168	1,288	4,457	16	.3
1971-72	3,107	1,316	4,424	-33	- .7
1972-73	3,055	1,320	4,376	-47	-1.1
1973-74	3,000	1,328	4,329	-47	-1.1
1974-75 est.	2,967	1,342	4,310	-19	- .4
1975-76 est.	2,931	1,353	4,284	-25	- .6
1976-77 est.	2,868	1,360	4,228	-55	-1.3
1977-78 est.	2,792	1,355	4,147	-81	-1.9
1978-79 est.	2.716	1,338	4,055	-92	-2.2
1979-80 est.	2,680	1,300	3,980	-75	-1.8
1980-81 est.	2,681	1,248	3,930	-50	-1.2

Table II indicates that school enrollment peaked in the 1970-71 school year at 4,457,325 students. The breakdown between elementary (K-8) and secondary (9-12) levels reveals that elementary enrollments are responsible for this decline. Enrollment at the elementary level actually peaked in the 1968-69 school year at a level of 3,186,181 students. Since that year, elementary school enrollments in the state have dropped an average of 37,000 students per year. Using current teacher/student ratios, this represents a reduction in the demand for elementary classroom teachers of approximately 1,360 teaching positions per year. Table II indicates that secondary level enrollments will not peak until the 1976-77 school year.

The decline in school enrollment has resulted in a well-publicized teacher surplus. Public and private teacher training institutions are graduating approximately 20,000 teachers each year into a job market that now exhibits a turnover rate of less than 10,000 teaching positions. This would indicate that roughly half of the students now graduating from training institutions will be unable to find employment as full-time classroom teachers. A survey of college placement offices throughout the state confirms this estimate.

Faculty Responsibility

We recommend that the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be allowed a change in budget formula to reduce student/teacher ratios in schools and departments of education in order to comply with the increased program workload and quality required in the Ryan Act.

Faculty assignments and responsibilities in the schools of education vary considerably between the University of California and the California University and State College system.

Faculty assignments at the University of California are based on a flexible staffing formula. The University of California schools of education distinguish between (1) regular faculty and (2) teacher trainers or supervisors. Teacher supervisors are responsible for all field training of teacher candidates and for a portion of the classroom instruction held on campus. These people generally have M.A.'s or Ed.D.'s, are not on the professional ladder from associate professor to full professor, have few research responsibilities, and generally have had extensive classroom experience. In the California State University and Colleges, all faculty members normally participate in both teacher training and in preparing higher degree (M.A.) candidates. There are no formal requirements for research.

Faculty workload in the California State University and Colleges system is generally determined by a systemwide workload formula. Each faculty member is budgeted to work 45 hours per week. Of this total, nine hours are given to committee work and administrative responsibilities. The remaining 36 hours represents 12 credit units, assuming one hour of lecture and two hours of preparation for each unit. This time is normally divided between scheduled classes and student teacher supervision. Each student teacher represents 1/2 credit hour so that a faculty member who wished to split his workload evenly would teach six credit hours of classes and supervise 12 student teachers (12 x 1/2 = 6 credits). Because one credit hour represents three hours of work (one for lecture and two for preparation), it is clear that 1/2 credit hour for each student means that a faculty member theoretically has only 1 1/2 hours to devote to each student per week. This time allotment includes not only counseling on campus, but classroom observation, consultation, and evaluation.

Much of the time alloted for student supervision is used traveling to and from the school site. Student teaching assignments are usually scattered throughout the region surrounding the training institution. Some training institutions have students in as many as 45 separate school districts, although the average appears to be approximately 15 districts.

The diversity of student teaching assignments is necessitated by a number of factors: (1) surrounding schools have become saturated with student teachers from a variety of training institutions, (2) many teachers are unwilling to accept student teachers, (3) secondary credential candidates

may need particular subject area assignments and (4) specialists require teaching assignments in special programs which are not locally available.

Training institutions have attempted to decrease the time lost in traveling by concentrating students in a single school. This permits supervisors to spend an entire day in one school and increases considerably the amount of time they can devote to each student.

Faculty members deal with the short time allotments by working overtime with students, concentrating students in one school to reduce travel time, or practicing a form of "selective visitations" in which some students are focused on and others are rarely seen.

The implementation of the Ryan Act should put an additional burden on the teacher supervisor, particularly in the larger training programs. Faculty members have already been compelled to devote a great amount of additional time to the revision and documentation of their training programs. Once fully implemented, and if these Ryan Act changes are to be more than paper revisions, these programs should require more time for student observation, counseling, program evaluation, and community involvement.

We believe that this increase in workload should be met by reducing the number of students assigned to each teacher trainer. This would necessitate an adjustment to the existing staffing formula. Proposals for new ratios should be supported by a comprehensive review of existing workloads and positive time accounting not only for teacher trainers but for the entire regular (research) faculty. The Ryan Act should lessen teaching burdens for the regular faculty in certain areas by limiting the number of professional education courses which can be required of a student. This could permit certain of these faculty members to supervise students or participate in the field experience of the teacher preparation program.

It is obvious that a ratio which provides a better professor/student mix necessitates either additional staff or fewer students. We believe that the improved ratio should be accomplished by reducing enrollment through attrition and a cutback in admissions rather than adding faculty.

Training institutions are reluctant to reduce enrollment in their programs on their own initiative because faculty positions, particularly in the California State University and Colleges system, depend on maintaining a certain level of enrollment. However, an alteration of the staffing formula would permit a reduction in enrollment with minimum effect on reduced faculty positions. By this means, a better ratio could be obtained which would not result in an additional cost to the state.

Some educators object to a reduction in enrollment in schools of education on the grounds that a qualified student should be permitted to pursue whatever career objective he chooses. It should be noted, however, that schools of education do not currently admit all qualified applicants to teacher training programs. Some schools report waiting lists and qualified applicants which number five times the size of the enrolled class. Therefore, a reduction in enrollment does not represent a major policy change but only an extension of existing policy.

Research

We recommend that the University of California and the California State University and Colleges be directed to submit an annual report to the Department of Education containing a summary of current research and experimental teaching projects conducted by the faculty of the schools and departments of education.

In most of the University of California teacher preparation programs, there is a definite separation of teacher trainers and their activities from the regular faculty who generally take no direct part in the field-based activities of teacher training. This separation is less evident at the smaller University of California campuses.

Regular faculty members usually possess Ph.D.'s or Ed.D.'s, are tenured, and are on the professional ladder from associate professor to full professor. Although there is a wide variation, regular faculty members normally teach four to six credit hours of scheduled classes per term. It is assumed that each hour taught involves two hours of outside preparation and consultation. Therefore, this aspect of the average faculty's workload represents approximately 15 hours of work per week. Faculty members are also assigned an average of nine doctoral students whose professional interests align with the specialty area of the professor. Finally, each faculty member is expected to engage in original research. The amount of time devoted by University of California School of Education faculty members to research projects varies tremendously. Several professors have estimated an average of 20 hours per week. The faculty member develops his own research topic and design, and his progress or published product is reviewed every two years by a departmental committee. Research projects conducted by school of education faculty members cover a variety of areas, including language development, educational policy (local, national, international), counseling, education history, curriculum development, and the development of teaching strategies.

It appears, however, that these research programs do not focus extensively on their own teacher preparation programs. This neglect of research into the resident teacher preparation program has been caused in part by the separation on many University of California campuses of research faculty and teacher preparation supervisors. The University contains extensive research capabilities, and yet this expertise often has not been directed toward their own professional programs. As a result, teacher training models developed by the teacher preparation faculty often lack sophisticated research or evaluation components. In addition, the state and federal governments have been compelled to provide special funds to support research in this area, such as the research component of the Research and Teacher Education programs and the Beginning Teacher Competency study conducted by the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

It is difficult to review the entire scope and relevance of research conducted by schools of education because these schools do not provide a summary of research and special projects on a regular basis. We believe that an annual summary should be prepared, containing a brief description

of current projects and their research objectives. This summary could be used not only for purposes of evaluating projects, but as a means of disseminating information to interested agencies and local school districts. There is currently little contact or communication between pre-service and in-service researchers in universities, colleges, school districts, and private organizations.

An annual report to the Department of Education would also permit this agency to compare its own research and program development needs with projects conducted on the University of California campuses. This could facilitate a closer alignment between research projects conducted on the university campus and the practical problems in the classroom.

While research is not a direct requirement of the California State University and Colleges Schools of Education, numerous projects are conducted on these campuses which should also be reported.

Minority Composition

A summary of the distribution of minority groups in teacher training institutions is presented in Table III. This distribution is compared with minority populations campus wide, in the public schools and within the public school staff.

TABLE III

Minority Composition in Public Schools and Teacher Training Institutions

	Percent of Total Enrollment				
	Black	Spanish-Surname	Asian	Indian	Total
A. Pupils					
Public School (K-12) Enrollment	9.8	17.2	3.0	.5	30.5
B. Teachers					
Public School Teachers and Administrators					
(1) excluding aides	5.0	2.6	2.1	.2	9.9
(2) including aides	11.2	5.6	3.9	.2	20.9
C. General Campuses					
State University and Colleges	4.8	5.4	5.0	1.0	16.2
University of California	3.6	3.2	7.3	.6	14.7
D. Schools of Education					
State University and Colleges	6.7	5.4	4.6	1.1	17.8
University of California	5.4	6.7	4.9	.4	17.4

Table III shows that, although black and Spanish-surname minorities constitute 27 percent of the public school enrollment, they are taught by a credentialed staff representing 7.6 percent of these two minorities. This representation has been improved by the inclusion of teacher aides who are often minority persons. However, it is apparent that minority representation on the professional public school staff is low.

Improved minority representation does not appear to be a realizable goal in the near future. Table III indicates that the representation of minority candidates in teacher training programs is considerably less than the minority composition of the public school student population. For example, Spanish-surname students constitute 17.2 percent of the public school population, yet this minority is represented by only 5.4 percent of the teacher candidates at the state colleges and 6.7 percent at the universities. Because minority representation in the schools of education is not much greater than on the existing staff in the public schools, a gradual improvement in representation in the public schools cannot be anticipated. In fact, if instructional aides are included in the public school staff, minority representation in the schools of education is significantly less than the public school staff.

Alternate Programs

Several institutions in the state have implemented innovative teacher training programs utilizing field training centers in the school district. These centers enable an institution to provide a complete training program off-campus. Under such programs, students are assigned to neighboring elementary or high schools and attend college classes in a classroom supplied by the school district. Two or more faculty supervisors are assigned to such centers to observe and consult with the teacher training students and cooperative teachers.

The concentration of students and the daily presence of supervisors permits a much more informal and continual interaction of student, cooperative teacher, and supervisor. This concentrated activity also necessitates the involvement of a greater percentage of the district faculty in the student teaching process and can bring a dynamic or innovative climate to the resident school staff. Teachers who might not normally choose to have a student teacher can be encouraged to participate if many members of the faculty have opened up their classrooms to students. The involvement of the majority of the faculty also provides students with the opportunity to observe a variety of teaching styles and take on many different teaching assignments.

The center approach therefore provides a new perspective to teacher preparation programs. Traditionally, these programs have been oriented solely toward pre-service instruction. Teacher trainers have usually attempted to locate the best teachers in the school district for their students, and have not recognized the opportunity their programs present as an in-service tool for the cooperating teachers and the entire faculty. When these possibilities have been recognized, time limitations on the staff have precluded in-service activities with school district personnel.

In addition, seminars and classes for cooperating teachers or the general faculty do not generate workload credit for teacher trainers. As a result, cooperating teachers have not received much special training in spite of the fact that they interact with the student teacher far more than the college trainer. A cooperating teacher spends approximately 25 hours per week with the student teacher whereas the college trainer is generally with the student less than two hours per week.

The saturated center approach can create problems and animosities in a resident faculty. The presence of many student teachers in one school can disrupt normal school routines and is sometimes viewed as a threat to traditional teaching styles and discipline. Even teachers receptive to change and committed to cooperative teaching, find themselves "saturated" after several years of student activity. The best center concept would appear to be a cyclical center which would organize a program around an important problem determined by the resident faculty, remain in the school for a period fo two or three years, and then move to another setting. This would (1) avoid the danger of any training programs slipping into a routine, (2) provide a recuperation period for resident district faculty, (3) allow other school faculties to benefit from the growth possibilities inherent in the center activity and (4) keep supervisors actively involved in the real problems of the average classroom rather than the managed atmosphere of a laboratory-type classroom.

CHAPTER III

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The 187,000 teachers now actively employed in California continue to receive professional training under a variety of local, state, and federal in-service training programs. Although a few of these in-service programs require mandatory attendance by teachers, the vast majority of in-service training depends on the individual teacher's initiative to continually upgrade his or her professional skills. To encourage teachers to participate in in-service programs, most school districts have established salary incentive schedules which provide a salary increase of 3 - 6 percent (of total income) for every 15 units of credit accumulated. Unfortunately, many of the in-service training classes maintain enrollments only because the fiscal incentive program virtually compels teachers to continually accumulate college or district credits. In-service training can thus become a mechanical accumulation of credits taken from a variety of separate colleges, extension offices, private corporations, county offices, and school districts.

In-service Training Programs

In-service training programs usually consist of academic coursework or teaching methods workshops and can be divided into four separate categories:

(1) University or college programs. These classes are usually taken to fulfill requirements for an advanced degree. Tuition is required.

(2) Extension courses. These courses are provided through a self-supporting office of a university or college and are normally presented in a workshop format. In addition to in-service credits, certain courses are accepted as credit for a higher degree. A course fee is required.

(3) Local school district programs. In-service training programs conducted by school districts consist of week-end workshops, conferences, short-day meetings, or evening classes. A minimal tuition is required.

A survey of school districts by this office indicates that few districts can provide exact information concerning local expenditures for in-service training. However, it is apparent that expenditures constitute considerably less than 1 percent of a school district budget. Larger districts may appoint an in-service training director to coordinate local and university resources, and may also provide a small budget for the employment of outside lecturers. However, few districts provide substantial funds for "release time" substitute teachers so that regular teachers can participate in in-service training programs during the work week. For this reason, training usually becomes the responsibility of the individual teacher and is put off until evenings, weekends, or summers.

Most districts do not take advantage of the in-service opportunities offered by the summer vacation. Teachers are usually required to report back to school several days prior to the beginning of the school year. However, this time is generally spent in conferences and housekeeping activities instead of in structured in-service programs.

(4) Categorical aid programs. Most categorical aid programs (bilingual, early childhood, etc.) now require an in-service training component. Attendance is usually mandatory for categorical program staff and aides. No tuition is required.

Regulations for categorical aid programs require participating districts to provide in-service training to be eligible for program funds. However, the level of expenditure for this function usually is not specified.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, represents the most identifiable source of supplemental funds for in-service training. In 1972-73, school districts reported an expenditure of $3.6 million in Title I funds for in-service training, or 3 percent of the entire federal grant ($120 million). Funds were used to provide in-service training to approximately 14,642 teachers, 9,237 aides, 2,503 volunteers, and a variety of specialists, program administrators, counselors, and other district personnel. Expenditures averaged approximately $100 per participant.

Other categorical aid programs, such as the Early Childhood Education, Educationally Disadvantaged Youth, Miller-Unruh, Bilingual Education, and Vocational Education programs also involve an in-service training component. However, few of these programs can provide detailed information on how much is spent on in-service training.

Office of In-service Training

We recommend that the Department of Education be directed to establish an Office of In-service Training which would (1) review and evaluate school district in-service training programs, (2) operate an information and dissemination center for effective programs, (3) assist and review the development of in-service programs on a regional basis and (4) administer a grant program for regional in-service training programs.

We believe that the current structure and funding of in-service training is in need of reorganization and coordination. It is apparent that the myriad forms of in-service training now offered by a variety of separate agencies and pursued individually by school teachers must be organized into an integrated in-service training program. District in-service programs must be coordinated with categorical aid, student teaching, county superintendent of schools, extension college, and private corporation programs. In addition, any successful district program must be closely coordinated with the pre-service training programs of the colleges and universities in the area so that these two major categories of teacher training -- pre-service and in-service -- do not continue to operate in mutual isolation. Both of these types of teacher training have insights beneficial to the other. Finally, the traditional "accumulated credits" approach to in-service training must be supplanted by a more dynamic approach involving the entire faculty.

A variety of "intervention" training models have been tested in the state. These programs have utilized release time, full faculty involvement, and innovative materials in an attempt to change teacher attitudes, as well as to provide teaching techniques and strategies to meet immediate problems. Unfortunately, these experimental models have usually been viewed as one-time projects, and seldom integrated with existing in-service programs.

We believe that school districts must be encouraged to develop plans for a comprehensive in-service training model which would coordinate a full-faculty intervention approach with the traditional in-service resources in the area. Such an effort would require leadership and coordination from a state-level office. This office could review the in-service training plans developed by groups of school districts and the county superintendent of schools, and assist these agencies to implement and evaluate their models. The office could also act as an evaluator, information center and disseminator of the results of in-service models tested in districts or regions. Finally, an in-service office could develop a proposal for, and then administer, a grant program to promote the development and operation of regional in-service training plans. Funds could be appropriated by the Legislature and allocated on a project approval basis according to guidelines developed by the in-service office and approved by the State Board of Education.

The initial operational year of this office would involve the development of guidelines and the allocation of "seed" grants to districts and regional representatives who wish to develop comprehensive regional proposals. Following an experimental stage, this office could develop an operational funding formula based on data collected from a variety of successful projects.

It should be anticipated that effective programs will be expensive. The Department of Education reports that experimental models tested under the Research and Teacher Education and the Professional Development programs involve a minimum support level of approximately $600 per teacher. Below this point, training programs ceased to be qualitatively different from traditional programs now provided on an individual credit basis to school teachers. Even at this minimum per capita level, the cost of providing in-service training to the state's 187,000 teachers would represent a total cost of more than $100 million. This cost would, of course, be spread over many years and would be shared by local, state, and federal agencies.

In many ways, an effective in-service education program could have a far greater impact on the quality of education than the complete reform of pre-service training programs. As we noted in Chapter 1, only 10,000 of a total working force of 180,000 teachers in the state are replaced each year. Thus, an improvement in the quality of pre-service training programs would not appreciably affect the overall quality of teaching in the state for a number of years. The development of effective in-service training programs could, on the other hand, result in an immediate improvement in the quality of education programs.

APPENDIX

Credentials Authorized by the New Law (Ryan Act)

I. TEACHING CREDENTIAL: with authorization in

A. Single subject instruction in

1. English
2. Physical Science
3. Mathematics
4. Social Science
5. Industrial Arts
6. Physical Education
7. Business
8. Music
9. Art
10. Home Economics
11. Foreign Languages
12. Government
13. History
14. Life Science
15. Agriculture

B. Multiple subject instruction

C. Specialist instruction in (including but not limited to)

1. Early childhood education
2. Reading specialist
3. Mathematics
4. Specialists in special education which may include teachers of the mentally retarded, educationally handicapped, physically retarded, and specialists in the teaching of pupils with speech and hearing disorders.
5. Bilingual/cross-cultural specialist

D. Designated subjects (technical, trade, or vocational education)

II. SERVICES CREDENTIAL:

A. Pupil personnel services, (including but not limited to)

1. Child welfare and attendance
2. Counseling
3. School psychology
4. School social work

B. Health services

C. Library science

D. Administration service

Reproduced by: Division of
INSTRUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
CTA Teacher Education Department
JAV:cc
12/11/74